

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
2 Kevin C. Wheeler (Bar No. 261177)  
3 *kevin.wheeler@lw.com*  
4 140 Scott Drive  
5 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
6 T: (650) 328-4600 | F: (650) 463-2600

7 Gregory K. Sobolski (Bar No. 267428)  
8 *gregory.sobolski@lw.com*  
9 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
10 San Francisco, California 94111  
11 T: (415) 395-8035 | F: (415) 395-8095

12 Attorneys for Defendants Shenzhen Senior Technology  
13 Material Co. Ltd. (US) Research Institute, and  
14 Shenzhen Senior Technology Material Co. Ltd.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

13 CELGARD, LLC,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 SHENZHEN SENIOR TECHNOLOGY  
17 MATERIAL CO. LTD. (US) RESEARCH  
18 INSTITUTE, AND SHENZHEN SENIOR  
19 TECHNOLOGY MATERIAL CO. LTD.,

20 Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:19-cv-5784-JST

DEFENDANTS SHENZHEN SENIOR  
TECHNOLOGY MATERIAL CO. LTD. AND  
SENIOR SHENZHEN SENIOR  
TECHNOLOGY MATERIAL CO. LTD. (US)  
OPPOSITION TO CELGARD, INC.'S  
MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY  
RESTRANING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION

21  
22 **REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

1 Plaintiff Celgard, Inc.’s (“Celgard”) second Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and  
 2 Preliminary Injunction, like its first motion, should be denied. As primary support for its motion,  
 3 Celgard claims that Shenzhen Senior Technology Material Co. Ltd. (US) (“Senior US”) is  
 4 dissolving in order to “transfer assets” and “destroy critical evidence.” That is wrong, and the  
 5 origins of Celgard’s latest motion are illuminating. On November 11, 2019, in a good faith effort  
 6 to avoid senseless waste of resources and burdening the Court with unnecessary motion practice,  
 7 counsel for Senior US sent Celgard a letter attaching a sworn declaration stating that Senior US  
 8 [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] Declaration of Kevin Wheeler at ¶ 2; Dkt. No. 60-12 ¶¶ 14, 16-20. The  
 10 declaration further states that Senior US has not [REDACTED] an initial funding  
 11 of \$1 million. [REDACTED] *Id.* Prior to this litigation, Senior US [REDACTED]  
 12 [REDACTED] *Id.* ¶¶ 7-8, 12-14. Given these facts,  
 13 Senior US requested that Celgard withdraw its claims against Senior US. Wheeler Decl. ¶ 2. To  
 14 allay any concern that Senior US would attempt to conduct business in the future, Senior US stated  
 15 in its declaration that it planned to [REDACTED]  
 16 [REDACTED] Dkt. No. 60-12 ¶¶ 7-8, 12-14.

17 In response to Senior US’s request, Celgard informed Senior US that it was “evaluating  
 18 [Senior US’s] request and will fully respond … once our investigation is complete.” Wheeler  
 19 Decl. ¶ 3. But instead of responding to Senior US’s request or attempting to meet and confer with  
 20 Senior US about any concerns, Celgard rushed to file its tactical and unnecessary motion for  
 21 temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction.

22 Had Celgard bothered to respond to Senior US’s letter and/or meet and confer, it would  
 23 have learned that Senior US is willing to stipulate that it will not dissolve during the pendency of  
 24 this lawsuit. And although Senior US [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED] **prior** to Celgard filing suit, Senior US will nevertheless preserve any minimal  
 26 assets remaining in its possession, including any documents in accordance with its discovery  
 27 obligations. In view of these facts, there is no urgency and no basis for a TRO. There also is no  
 28 basis in law or fact for Celgard’s request for a bond, let alone a \$100 million dollar bond. Indeed,

1 Celgard does not dispute any fact in Senior US's sworn declaration about Senior US's [REDACTED]  
2 [REDACTED] Nor has Celgard cited anything  
3 else—no law and no facts—to support its astounding request.

4 Senior US respectfully requests that the Court (i) deny Celgard's Motion for a Temporary  
5 Restraining Order, and (ii) order the parties to meet and confer within the next two weeks on the  
6 remaining issues raised in Celgard's motion in an attempt to resolve those issues without Court  
7 intervention.

8  
9  
10 Dated: November 21, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

11 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

12 */s/ Kevin Wheeler*

13 Kevin C. Wheeler (Bar No. 261177)  
Gregory K. Sobolski (Bar No. 267428)

14 *Attorneys for Defendants Shenzhen Senior*  
15 *Technology Material Co. Ltd. (US) Research*  
16 *Institute, and Shenzhen Senior Technology*  
17 *Material Co. Ltd.*